neither accepts nor denies that which, is hypothesis °:nly. Zola had known Littrd, "Wybouroff, and others, and he tiad at least met Pierre Laffitte; but his creed, apparently, hiad conie to him less directly than indirectly, that is filtered "through the philosophy of Taine. For the rest, as a great Admirer of M. Berthelot, he was a fervent believer in Science. In spite of the rnanj limits to our knowledge Nowadays, he held that Science "would some day succeed in Solving directly or indirectly the whole riddle of the nni-

v-erse. Nevertheless, though he could not believe in the supernatural such as it -was expounded by the Christian oliurches, he fully understood that many should cling to such beliefs in their craving for some certainty and consolation. It seemed to him monstrous, however, that so many grossly superstitious practices should have been grafted on the elementary principles of Christianity, and that the Eo-

ill xnan Catholic Church should be primarily an engine Apolitical domination. At the same time he held the opinion that there was far more "broadness of views among Catholics generally than among Protestants. latter oertainly had one good trait, their minds might be narrrower, their self-righteousness might be almost repulsive, •fcheir rigidity of principles at least stimulated fulness, whereof, said Zola, they had given conspicuous proof Dreyfus during the case. The French **Protestants** were only a handful, but they possessed the courage convictions; they had not hesitated to testify to truth,

The reader may think it curious that Zola should have expressed himself as a Positivist, and yet have harboured sundry petty superstitions, such as were enumerated in a

whatever risk they ran in doing so.